

## Hughes, Jennifer

---

**From:** Pat Russell [flanagan112@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 22, 2010 1:57 PM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen; Cathie Blosser; Bob Murch; bryony@birdlink.net; Dick and Sally Shook; eileen@eakinslaw.com; Eric (CPO) Shawn; erniep@hbapdx.org; j.landon@generaltree.com; jim@woodlandmgmt.com; rutholer@earthlink.net; tnixon@lrsarchitects.com; wjhowe@gevurtzmenashe.com; anatta@sandoth.com; bknotts@odf.state.or.us; brian.monberg@oregonmetro.gov; Buehrig, Karen; clm@spiritone.com; Cartasegna, Mary Jo; Chips Janger; craigchisholm@comcast.net; dana.lucero@oregonmetro.gov; dschroeder1@juno.com; Ed Riddle; Eleanore Hunter (Oak Lodge Comm Council); Klepper, Emily; Gertler, Elissa; Gilmour, Cam; gcline@odf.state.or.us; Hughes, Jennifer; cijes@bctonline.com; jillmm@gmail.com; Jim Labbe; joybottinelli@comcast.net; Lehan, Charlotte; f411586@yahoo.com; lynnmari97267@yahoo.com; meyer97267@yahoo.com; mdschrd@aol.com; imvingram@aol.com; mike\_dahlstrom@co.washington.or.us; patg@hhpr.com; rlp@hevanet.com; phil@lisanattifoods.com; Polk, Eben; randall.duncan@harrang.com; sentinelskip@gmail.com; speiffer@perkinscoie.com  
**Cc:** McCallister, Mike; Cartmill, Barbara; Butman, Laurel; Wheeler, Steve; BCCMail  
**Subject:** RE: ellenrog@co.clackamas.or.us; ellenrog@comcast.net

Dear Ellen and Planning Staff,

Considering where the BCC is in their deliberations (being far from our goals of maximum tree protection), I do have a suggested minor change to one of the definitions ("Tree Removal"). Also, I would hope that the BCC recognizes that many still expect a tree canopy protection, rehabilitation and restoration program, especially within the Kellogg-Mt. Scott Watershed (along with a recognition and commitment by the BCC that salmon recovery in the KMS is a requirement and commitment on the county's part and funding will be pursued for salmon access to the watershed). One of the greatest impacts of development within the KMS watershed has been the loss of native tree canopy, resulting in loss of precipitation absorption, ground water replenishment, continuance of year around flows of adequate volume for sustainable salmon populations from the mouth of the watershed to the headwaters. We can significantly improve salmon sustainability in the KMS with an aggressive and funded program, similar in scope to that of Johnson Creek, Tyrone Creek, etc. (committing to intra-agency cooperation and flexing of resources). Except for a few areas, our development densities do all for proliferation of LARGE, MATURE, NATIVE trees, such as Douglas Fir, Cedar, Oregon White Oak, Big Leaf Maple, Alder, Ash, etc.

Given that its unlikely we will see major concessions to commit seriously to salmon recovery, I recommend a slight modification of the definitions:

Proposed New Section 1002.04 (8) Tree Removal: ...removal shall include an procedure the natural result of which is to cause the death or substantial destruction of the tree, including, but not limited to: topping and severe cutting back of limbs AND ROOTS to such as degree...

Please forward my concerns to staff and the BCC. Thanks

Pat Russell  
16358 SE Hearthwood Drive  
Clackamas, OR 97015  
(503) 656-9681  
Email: [flanagan112@hotmail.com](mailto:flanagan112@hotmail.com)

---

From: EllenRog@co.clackamas.or.us  
To: blossom.dolan@comcast.net; bobmurch@mac.com; bryony@birdlink.net; dicksallyshook@juno.com; eileen@eakinslaw.com; eric.shawn@comcast.net; erniep@hbapdx.org; j.landon@generaltree.com;

**EXHIBIT** 182  
2D0-219

## Hughes, Jennifer

---

**From:** ZoningInfo  
**Sent:** Monday, August 23, 2010 7:20 AM  
**To:** Hughes, Jennifer  
**Subject:** FW: Purposed County Tree Ordinance

Customer Service  
Land Use & Zoning  
Clackamas County  
Phone Room – 503-742-4500  
[zoninginfo@clackamas.us](mailto:zoninginfo@clackamas.us)  
<http://www.clackamas.us/transportation/planning/>

Beginning June 1, 2010 the Permits Lobby hours of operation are 9:00 am - 4:00 pm, Monday through Thursday. Land Use and Zoning remains open for calls, e-mails and scheduled meetings from 7:00 am to 6:00 pm. The office is closed on Fridays.

---

**From:** NICHOLAS MCCLOUD [mailto:indidawg@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 21, 2010 9:11 AM  
**To:** ZoningInfo  
**Subject:** Purposed County Tree Ordinance

To whom it may concern,

In recent meetings a common theme from county homeowners was that they loved their trees, but did not want the county to dictate to them how they should care for their trees on their own property. Many were concerned that their rights were to be taken away and that there would be unknown permit fees and report costs relating to the ordinance.

I am writing this e-mail to reaffirm this position. Stop this nonsense.

Further, you have wasted \$120,000 in tax payers money studying this proposal. Money better spent would have planted trees on county property.

Nick McCloud  
Molalla area

---

NOTE: This message was trained as non-spam. If this is wrong, please correct the training as soon as possible.

Spam

Not spam

Forget previous vote

EXHIBIT 183  
ZDO-219

**Hughes, Jennifer**

---

**From:** Rogalin, Ellen  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 24, 2010 9:11 AM  
**To:** 'Carol'  
**Cc:** Hughes, Jennifer  
**Subject:** RE: tree ordinance

Thanks, Carol. I appreciate your feedback.

Ellen Rogalin  
Community Relations Specialist  
Department of Transportation and Development Development Services Building 150 Beaver Creek Rd., Oregon City, OR 97045  
503.742.4274

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Carol [mailto:clm@SpiritOne.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 23, 2010 10:02 PM  
**To:** Rogalin, Ellen  
**Subject:** tree ordinance

Hi Ellen

I was able to open and read the tree ordinance fine this time; thank you for trying it again and making it available to me. I'm sure there will be feedback from all sorts of folks, but my feeling is at least there will be something on the books as a starting point and a reference for planning staff. Hope fully, they'll adhere to the goals behind it. Carol Mastronarde

--  
BEGIN-ANTISPAM-VOTING-LINKS

-----  
Teach CanIt if this mail (ID 01CW526Fr) is spam:  
Spam: <http://mhub.co.clackamas.or.us/canit/b.php?i=01CW526Fr&m=5bb56607a25e&c=s>  
Not spam: <http://mhub.co.clackamas.or.us/canit/b.php?i=01CW526Fr&m=5bb56607a25e&c=n>  
Forget vote: <http://mhub.co.clackamas.or.us/canit/b.php?i=01CW526Fr&m=5bb56607a25e&c=f>  
-----

END-ANTISPAM-VOTING-LINKS

EXHIBIT 184  
2D0-219

## ZoningInfo

---

**From:** Sittser [sittser@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 26, 2010 12:09 AM  
**To:** ZoningInfo  
**Subject:** Comment on proposed tree ordinance

Thank you for giving people the opportunity to comment.

I disagree with the idea behind this ordinance and respectfully ask that it not be created. It is a case of Government trying to curb a legal activity by creating a penalty for doing the legal activity.

Here is my reasoning: Either it is legal to clear cut trees on a piece of property or it is not. If it is legal, then it should be allowed without penalty. The County should not act to reduce the development potential of the property (hence, reduce its value) because a legal activity has been performed on the property. It would be wrong for the County to create a new regulation that takes the development potential out property just because it has been clear cut.

Imagine if the County wanted to reduce smoking. Instead of outlawing the use of a legal product, the County passed a law that says, "If you smoke a cigarette (a legal act), then you can't enter a retail establishment for 24 hours." Fewer people would smoke. But that doesn't make the law right. It would be as wrong as a law that says, "If you cut the trees on your property (a legal act), you can't develop that property for five years because you didn't make prior arrangements with the County.

It's the same principal. Please don't create this clear cut tree ordinance!

Stan Sittser  
26460 SE Wally Road  
Boring, OR 970009

503-464-8271  
[sittser@verizon.net](mailto:sittser@verizon.net)

---

Spam

Not spam

Forget previous vote